

REMARKS

Claims 1, and 3-29 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, new claims 28 and 29 have been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 9, 13, and 17-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,622,682 to Kumakura in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,896 to Tamura *et al.* (“Tamura”). Claims 4, 5, 10, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kumakura in view of Tamura, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0150840 to Farrell *et al.* (“Farrell”). Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kumakura in view of Tamura and Farrell, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0140963 to Otsuka. Claims 8, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kumakura in view of Tamura and Farrell, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,999,113 to Omura.

For *at least* the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 9, and 13 are patentable over the proposed combination of Kumakura and Tamura. For example, claims 1, 9, and 13 recite, in some variation, that only the first communication means is automatically turned off when the data communication of the predetermined data segment is not conducted. The Examiner acknowledges that Kumakura does not teach this feature, but contends that col. 18, line 48 to col. 19, line 4 of Tamura cure this deficiency. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The portions of Tamura relied upon for allegedly teaching this feature disclose that a child camera 110 turns off its power supply automatically based on the connection strength between the child camera 110 and the parent camera 120. Similarly, the parent camera 120 turns off its power supply automatically based on the connection strength between the parent camera 120 and the printer 130 (Tamura, col. 18, lines 48 to col. 19, line 4 – e.g., “when the state of communication between the parent camera 120 and the child camera 110 plus the printer 130 is worsened to be cut, the parent camera 120 turns off the power supply automatically, whereby consumption of batteries can be prevented”). Turning off the power supply based on the connection strength does not teach or suggest turning off only the claimed first communication means when the data communication of the predetermined data segment (which is part of the print data) is not conducted. That is, the basis for turning off the transmitting means in Tamura is altogether different from the basis for turning off the first communication means in the claim.

In addition, col. 18, line 64 to col. 19, line 4 of Tamura disclose that if the state of communication does not get worse, the power of the camera and the communication means is kept ON even when the data communication of the alleged predetermined data segment is not conducted. This is clearly different from what claim 1, which recites that only the first communication means is automatically turned off when the data communication of the predetermined data segment is not conducted.

Moreover, since Tamura only teaches using only one transmission means for transmitting print-related data between a camera and a printer (or a child camera and a parent camera), Tamura’s teachings when incorporated into Kumakura still do not disclose or suggest turning off only one communication means (e.g., see FIG. 4 of Tamura - transmitter-receiver unit for order

receiving 211). As submitted in the previous Amendment filed September 15, 2008, Kumakura teaches transmitting all the print-related data via only one modem - the high speed MODEM 13 in the transmitter 1 (see previous Amendment, page 13, last paragraph). If this high speed MODEM 13 is turned off, no print-related data could be transmitted at all in Kumakura rendering Kumakura inoperable for its intended purpose. Also, the combination still does not teach transmitting one part of the print data using one communication means and another part of the print data using another communication means, as required by claims 1, 9, and 13. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established by the Examiner.

Moreover, claim 27 recites that the first communication means is automatically turned off after said predetermined data segment is transferred from said printer controlling device to said printer, and said first communication means remains turned off while the other data segment is being transferred from said printer controlling device to said printer using said second communication means. This feature is not even remotely suggested by the combination of Tamura and Kumakura since as noted above, Tamura does not teach more than one communication means between two communicating devices, let alone teach that one communication means is turned off while the other one is operating. Therefore, claim 27 is patentable over the alleged combination of Tamura and Kumakura. Alternatively, claim 27 is patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Claims 3 and 17-26 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Claims 4, 5, 10, and 14-16 depend from claims 1, 9, or 13. Since Farrell does not cure the deficient teachings of Kumakura and Tamura with respect to claims 1, 9, or 13, Applicants

respectfully submit that claims 4, 5, 10, and 14-16 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1. Since Otsuka does not cure the deficient teachings of Kumakura and Tamura with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6 and 7 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Claims 8, 11, and 12 depend from claims 1 or 9. Since Omura does not cure the deficient teachings of Kumakura and Tamura with respect to claims 1 and 9, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8, 11 and 12 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

New Claims

New claims 28 and 29 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency. Further, claims 28 and 29 recite features similar to claim 27, and thus, are patentable for reasons similar to those given above with respect to claim 27.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/808,461

Attorney Docket No.: Q80447

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 30, 2009

/Quadeer A. Ahmed/
Quadeer A. Ahmed
Registration No. 60,835